

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

HTC AMERICA, INC., a Washington  
corporation, HTC CORPORATION, a  
Taiwanese corporation, and EXEDEA  
INC., a Texas corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SOFTVIEW LLC, a Washington limited  
liability company,

Defendant.

No. 2:11-cv-908

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
RELIEF

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiffs HTC America Inc., HTC Corporation, and Exedea Inc. (collectively “HTC”) hereby allege for their Complaint against Defendant SoftView LLC (“Defendant”), on personal knowledge as to their own activities and on information and belief as to the activities of others, as follows:

**THE PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff HTC America, Inc. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Plaintiff HTC Corp. and is incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, with its principal place of business at 13920 S.E. Eastgate Way, Suite 400, Bellevue, Washington 98005.

557869.01

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF  
(No. 2:11-cv-908) – 1

91004-1110/LEGAL20998677.1

**Perkins Coie LLP**  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Phone: 206.359.8000  
Fax: 206.359.9000

1           2.       Plaintiff HTC Corporation is a Taiwanese corporation with its principal place of  
2 business located at 23 Xinghua Road, Taoyuan City, Taoyuan County 330, Taiwan, Republic of  
3 China.  
4

5  
6           3.       Plaintiff Exedea Inc. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Plaintiff HTC Corp. and is  
7 incorporated under the laws of the State of Texas with its principal place of business at 5950  
8 Corporate Drive, Houston, TX 77036.  
9

10  
11           4.       On information and belief, Defendant SoftView LLC is a Washington limited  
12 liability company with its principal place of business at 112 Ohio Street, Suite 202, Bellingham,  
13 Washington 98225.  
14  
15

#### 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5       This is a declaratory judgment action seeking a determination that HTC does not  
infringe any claim of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,461,353 or 7,831,926 under 35 U.S.C. § 271, and that  
these patents are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.

6       On information and belief, Defendant is the owner by assignment of United States  
Patent No. 7,461,353 (the '353 patent), which is entitled "Scalable Display of Internet Content  
on Mobile Devices" and which issued on December 2, 2008. A true and correct copy of the '353  
patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

7       On information and belief, Defendant is the owner by assignment of United States  
Patent No. 7,831,926 (the '926 patent), which is entitled "Scalable Display of Internet Content  
on Mobile Devices" and with issued on November 9, 2010. A true and correct copy of the '926  
patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

#### 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8       This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. On information and belief,  
Defendant maintains its principal place of business in Bellingham, Washington, a city within this  
District, and has transacted business in Washington and in this District. Further, on information  
and belief, Defendant has continuous and systematic contacts with the State of Washington and

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF  
(No. 2:11-cv-908) – 2

**Perkins Coie LLP**  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Phone: 206.359.8000  
Fax: 206.359.9000

1 the Western District of Washington, has purposely directed its activities at the State of  
 2 Washington, and this action arises out of and relates to those activities.  
 3

4 9. On information and belief, among the federal judicial districts in the state of  
 5 Washington, Defendant has the most significant contacts with the Western District of  
 6 Washington.  
 7

8 10. As alleged more fully below, there is an actual, immediate dispute existing  
 9 between HTC and Defendant regarding the invalidity and noninfringement of the '353 patent and  
 10 the '926 patent.  
 11

12 11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over HTC's causes of action asserted  
 13 here pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a), because those claims arise under the patent laws  
 14 of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, *et seq.*, and under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act,  
 15 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.  
 16

17 12. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c)  
 18 and 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).  
 19

## 20 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

21 13. HTC repeats and realleges the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 12 in their  
 22 entirety.  
 23

24 14. HTC's sales, marketing, and product-support activities targeted to the American  
 25 market are managed from Bellevue, Washington, a city within this District. HTC maintains its  
 26 sales-and-marketing documents, including sales literature, forecasts, and market analyses that  
 27 pertain to the United States market primarily in Bellevue and to a lesser degree in Taiwan. HTC  
 28 maintains engineering, development, and manufacturing documents that relate to the Accused  
 29 Products (the term is defined in paragraph 17 below), as well as related royalty and partner  
 30 agreements, primarily in Taiwan and to a lesser degree in Bellevue. Design documents that  
 31 relate to the Accused Products are maintained in Seattle and Bellevue, Washington, as well as in  
 32 Taiwan and San Francisco.  
 33

1           15.     Shortly before filing this complaint, HTC learned that Defendant has contended in  
2 court filings in a separate lawsuit (to which HTC is not a party) that HTC's products infringe one  
3 or more claims of the '353 and '926 patents. Specifically, Defendant SoftView is the plaintiff in  
4 a separate patent infringement lawsuit pending in Delaware against two other companies. HTC  
5 is informed and believes that, more than a year after commencing that suit, Defendant SoftView  
6 has petitioned the Delaware District Court for leave to amend its pleadings to add HTC and other  
7 parties as new defendants who it claims infringe the '353 and '926 patents. SoftView did not  
8 communicate these allegations to HTC before filing its motion to amend. Upon information and  
9 belief, Defendant SoftView has not received leave to file such an amended complaint against  
10 HTC in the Delaware District Court, and Defendant SoftView's motion for leave to file its  
11 proposed amended complaint is still pending.  
12

13           16.     In contrast to its extensive connections with this judicial district, HTC has no  
14 offices in Delaware. As of the date of this filing, HTC has no plans to open a facility, retain  
15 personnel, or otherwise establish business operations in Delaware. HTC has no corporate  
16 repository of any of the above documents in Delaware.  
17

18           17.     In its proposed complaint, Defendant alleges for the first time that HTC infringes  
19 the '353 and '926 patents through making, using, offering to sell or selling devices having the  
20 Android Operating System and a web browser, including but not limited to devices sold under  
21 the trade names Aria, Desire, Dream, Eris, EVO, Hero, Incredible, Inspire, G1, G2, Legend,  
22 Magic, MyTouch, Nexus, Tattoo, Thunderbolt, Shift, and Wildfire. Collectively, these devices  
23 are referred to as the "Accused Products."  
24

25           18.     HTC disputes the allegations of infringement and validity contained in Softview's  
26 proposed amended complaint.  
27

28           19.     HTC has sold and will continue to sell one or more of the Accused Products in the  
29 United States and seeks declaratory relief concerning the issues of noninfringement and validity  
30 surrounding these patents.  
31

1           20.     Litigation of this matter in this district is appropriate, particularly given the  
2  
3 principal places of business of the parties.  
4

5                                 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
6           **(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT ('353 PATENT))**  
7

8           21.     HTC repeats and realleges the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 20 in their  
9  
10 entirety.  
11

12           22.     HTC has not infringed, has not willfully infringed, is not now infringing, has not  
13  
14 contributorily infringed, and has not induced infringement of any valid claim of the '353 patent,  
15  
16 either directly or indirectly, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.  
17

18           23.     HTC is informed and believes, based on Defendant's allegations in the proposed  
19  
20 complaint that it has sought leave to file against HTC, that Defendant contends that one or more  
21  
22 claims of the '353 patent are infringed by HTC's alleged manufacture, use, or sale of certain  
23  
24 Accused Products.  
25

26           24.     Accordingly, a valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between  
27  
28 HTC and Defendant, relating to the noninfringement of the '353 patent. HTC desires a judicial  
29  
30 determination and declaration of the respective rights and duties of the parties herein. Such a  
31  
32 determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that the parties  
33  
34 may ascertain their respective rights and duties.  
35

36                                 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
37           **(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT ('926 PATENT))**  
38

39           25.     HTC repeats and realleges the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 24 in their  
40  
41 entirety.  
42

43           26.     HTC has not infringed, has not willfully infringed, is not now infringing, has not  
44  
45 contributorily infringed, and has not induced infringement of any valid claim of the '926 patent,  
46  
47 either directly or indirectly, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.  
48

49           27.     HTC is informed and believes, based on Defendant's allegations in the proposed  
50  
51 complaint that it has sought leave to file against HTC, that Defendant contends that one or more

1 claims of the '926 patent are infringed by HTC's alleged manufacture, use, or sale of certain  
 2 Accused Products.  
 3

4 28. Accordingly, a valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between  
 5 HTC and Defendant, relating to the noninfringement of the '926 patent. HTC desires a judicial  
 6 determination and declaration of the respective rights and duties of the parties herein. Such a  
 7 determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that the parties  
 8 may ascertain their respective rights and duties.  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13

14  
 15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 16 **(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY ('353 PATENT))**  
 17

18 29. HTC repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 28 in their  
 19 entirety.  
 20

21 30. HTC believes that the claims of the '353 patent are invalid because they fail to  
 22 satisfy the conditions and requirements for patentability as set forth, *inter alia*, in §§102, 103 and  
 23 112 of Title 35 of the United States Code.  
 24  
 25  
 26

27 31. HTC is informed and believes, based on Defendant's allegations in the proposed  
 28 complaint it has sought leave to file against HTC, that Defendant contends that the claims of the  
 29 '353 patent are valid and enforceable.  
 30  
 31  
 32

33 32. Accordingly, a valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between  
 34 HTC and Defendant, relating to the validity of the '353 patent. HTC desires a judicial  
 35 determination and declaration of the respective rights and duties of the parties herein. Such a  
 36 determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that the parties  
 37 may ascertain their respective rights and duties.  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43

44 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 45 **(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY ('926 PATENT))**  
 46

47 33. HTC repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 32 in their  
 48 entirety.  
 49  
 50  
 51

34. HTC believes that the claims of the '926 patent are invalid because they fail to satisfy the conditions and requirements for patentability as set forth, *inter alia*, in §§ 102, 103 and 112 of Title 35 of the United States Code.

35. HTC is informed and believes, based on Defendant's allegations in the proposed complaint it has sought leave to file against HTC, that Defendant contends that the claims of the '926 patent are valid and enforceable.

36. Accordingly, a valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between HTC and Defendant, relating to the validity of the '926 patent. HTC desires a judicial determination and declaration of the respective rights and duties of the parties herein. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that the parties may ascertain their respective rights and duties.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, HTC requests entry of judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:

1. A declaration that HTC has not infringed, willfully infringed, induced others to infringe or contributed to the infringement of any valid claim of the '353 patent;
2. A declaration that all claims of the '353 patent are invalid;
3. A declaration that HTC has not infringed, willfully infringed, induced others to infringe or contributed to the infringement of any valid claim of the '926 patent;
4. A declaration that all claims of the '926 patent are invalid;
5. A declaration that this is an "exceptional case" under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and an award granting HTC its costs and reasonable attorneys' fees as permitted under that statute; and
6. Any other and further relief that this Court may deem just and proper.

#### DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, HTC demands a trial by jury.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF  
(No. 2:11-cv-908) – 7

1  
2 DATED: May 31, 2011  
3  
4  
5  
6

Respectfully submitted,

7 By: /s/ Ryan J. McBrayer

8 Ryan J. McBrayer, WSBA No. 28338

9 RMcBrayer@perkinscoie.com

10 **PERKINS COIE LLP**

11 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800

12 Seattle, WA 98101-3099

13 Telephone: 206.359.8000

14 Facsimile: 206.359.9000  
15

16 Of Counsel:

17 Leo L. Lam (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)

18 Ashok Ramani (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)

19 **KEKER & VAN NEST LLP**

20 710 Sansome Street

21 San Francisco, CA 94111-1704

22 Telephone: (415) 391-5400

23 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188  
24  
25

26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs HTC America, Inc.,  
27 HTC Corp., and Exedea Inc.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF  
(No. 2:11-cv-908) – 8

91004-1110/LEGAL20998677.1

**Perkins Coie LLP**  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Phone: 206.359.8000  
Fax: 206.359.9000